## Case 1:12-cr-00813-PGG Document 37 Filed 09/12/13 Page 1 of 25

D8g1paps 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 4 V. 12-CR-813 (PGG) 5 PAUL PAPPAS, 6 Defendant. Sentencing -----x 7 8 New York, N.Y. August 16, 2013 9 10:18 a.m. 10 Before: 11 HON. PAUL G. GARDEPHE, 12 District Judge 13 14 **APPEARANCES** 15 PREET BHARARA United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York 16 RUSSELL CAPONE 17 Assistant United States Attorney WILLKIE FARR & GALLAGHER, LLP 18 Attorneys for Defendant 19 BY: MARTIN KLOTZ, ESQ. MORGAN J. CLARK, ESQ. 20 21 22 23 24 25

D8g1paps (In open court; case called) 1 2 THE CLERK: Is the government ready? 3 MR. CAPONE: Yes. Russell Capone for the government. 4 Good morning, Judge. 5 THE COURT: Good morning. 6 THE CLERK: Defendant ready? 7 MR. KLOTZ: Yes, your Honor. Martin Klotz and Morgan Clark for Mr. Pappas. 8 9 THE COURT: Good morning. 10 All right. In preparation for sentencing, I have read the presentence report dated August 8<sup>th</sup>, I've read Mr. Klotz' 11 August 5<sup>th</sup>, 2013 sentencing submission and the exhibits to 12 13 that submission, including Dr. Drob's report and the letters 14 from Mr. Pappas' family and friends. I've also read the government's August 12<sup>th</sup>, 2013 submission. 15 16 Mr. Klotz, have you read the presentence report and 17 its recommendation and discussed it with Mr. Pappas? 18 MR. KLOTZ: Yes, your Honor. Mr. Pappas, have you read the presentence 19 THE COURT: 20 report and its recommendation and discussed it with Mr. Klotz? 21 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have.

THE COURT: Mr. Klotz, do you have any objections to the factual portions of the presentence report?

MR. KLOTZ: I think we sent a few in and they were

22

23

24

25

included in the revised report, so nothing further, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Capone, does the government have any objections to the factual portions of the presentence report?

MR. CAPONE: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: And I hereby adopt the findings of fact set forth in the presentence report.

Although I'm not required to impose sentence in accordance with the Sentencing Guidelines, I am required to consider the recommended range under the guidelines. Here, the probation department applied the fraud guidelines and concluded that Mr. Pappas' base offense level is 7. The offense level was increased by 12 levels because the loss resulting from his conduct was between 200,000 and \$400,000. His offense level was further increased by two levels because he wilfully attempted to obstruct and impede the administration of justice with respect to the investigation of the offense. His offense level was reduced by three levels for acceptance of responsibility, resulting in a total offense level of 18.

The probation department determined that Mr. Pappas has no criminal record. Accordingly, he falls into criminal history category I.

Offense level 18 at criminal history category I yields a guidelines range of 27 to 33 months' imprisonment.

Mr. Klotz, does the defense have any objections to the accuracy of the guidelines calculations in the presentence

1 report?

MR. KLOTZ: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Capone, does the government have any objections to the calculations regarding the guidelines set forth in the presentence report?

MR. CAPONE: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: And based upon my independent evaluation of the Sentencing Guidelines, I accept the calculations set forth in the presentence report. Accordingly, I find that the offense level is 18, the criminal history category is I, and the recommended sentencing range is 27 to 33 months' imprisonment.

I'll hear from you, Mr. Klotz, as to an appropriate sentence.

MR. KLOTZ: Thank you, your Honor.

Judge, the single largest issue for consideration at sentencing is the state of Mr. Pappas' mental health and what role that played in the offense and what role it ought to play in a just and fair sentence to be imposed by your Honor today.

Nobody disputes that Mr. Pappas has very serious mental health issues. They go back a very long period of time. They were exacerbated by a serious accident in the year 2000. They've persisted since then. He has, until incarceration, in my judgment, never really been properly treated. Part of that is his own fault for not seeking appropriate treatment, but I

think his mental state has been a contributing factor to the conduct here, and the real issue, I don't think anybody disputes that Mr. Pappas has very serious mental health issues. The question is, what role did they play in explaining the offense conduct and in potentially mitigating the sentence.

The government cites three -- I think three core facts that, in the government's view, argue that the mental health issues ought to be put to the side and not given any weight in considering an appropriate sentence.

Factor -- the first factor is that the offense conduct here required a great deal of planning and took place over an extended period of time. It wasn't an impulse offense.

The second factor is that the offense conduct involved deceit and in particular the impersonation of other persons on whose behalf Mr. Pappas claimed unemployment benefits.

And the third factor is that Mr. Pappas, knowing of the investigation, obstructed justice.

And I'd like to address those three factors in turn and explain why I think Mr. Pappas' mental health really is a mitigating factor with respect to all of those.

First, with respect to the fact that the offense was an elaborate offense and was carried out over a period of I believe two years, this was not an offense like a series of bank robberies. Mr. Pappas had an elaborate, albeit in my view misguided and, frankly, nutty view of the conduct in which he

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

was engaged in which it was, while reprehensible in a moral sense, technically legally permissible. He talked himself into an elaborate theory about he was entitled to put relatives on the payroll even though they didn't do any work.

THE COURT: Let me ask you this. I had the sense that these printing companies had been sold at this point. Did he still have a printing company or was this some other business?

MR. KLOTZ: He had the printing companies which did some consulting work in the printing business, as I understand it. He also had a number of real estate properties that required management that I believe were done through the aegis of the parent company. So there was business activity. not totally a fictitious company. And there were other employees or persons affiliated with the companies. This is not to say that the relatives and friends on whose behalf he claimed unemployment benefits did any genuine work or were paid any money. But Mr. Pappas really viewed himself as, to some degree, akin to somebody who finds lawful ways of minimizing their taxes and you might criticize them for, you know, exploiting loopholes but in their mind they're legal loopholes. We haven't offered this as a defense to the case. You know, Mr. Pappas knew that what he was doing was inappropriate, and he certainly knew that he was under investigation and the government viewed what he was doing as inappropriate. interestingly enough, the government cites the fact that he

knew he was under investigation and attempted to obstruct justice, and I'll get to that in a minute, but he also talked to the investigating agents and tried to persuade them that what he was doing was lawful. Unsuccessfully, of course, because what he was doing was not lawful, but it's not — it really reflects in my mind some of the conclusions that Dr. Drob came to in his report. Mr. Pappas is an individual who has delusions of grandiosity. He thought he'd come up with a really clever theory to outsmart the government. He has a hard time distinguishing between fantasy and reality. He doesn't appreciate the boundaries of socially appropriate behavior. And a lot of what was going on was this. It doesn't negate his guilt. He's never, you know, asserted that this negates his guilt. But I think it's an important background factor to be taken into consideration.

THE COURT: From my review of the materials in the case, it seems to me that Mr. Pappas has very substantial assets, which raises the question of why it was that he was engaged in a fraud that, while not insignificant in the amount of money that was ultimately taken, doesn't seem that it would be necessary for him to maintain his lifestyle. So can you speak to motive at all?

MR. KLOTZ: I mean, I think, frankly, a lot of it has to do with his view of himself as being really clever and came up with a way of legally exploiting loopholes in the system and

it was more for that than the actual income. Although I would also say, on the income side, standing alone, Mr. Pappas has substantial assets, but they're not terribly liquid and his cash flow is not terribly great, and as you know from the presentence report, he's got very serious problems with some of his children. Those require expenses. So I think there was an economic motivation as well. But I think the motivation was — was split between the economic motivation and the motivation of showing how smart he was and beating the government at something that he viewed as an exploitable loophole in the law.

The second factor that the government points to is Mr. Pappas' appropriation of other people's identities and impersonation of several of the people on whose behalf he claimed unemployment benefits. Frankly, if you listen — the persons he impersonated were female in telephone calls to the unemployment insurance people. If you listen to the phone calls — and I think the investigation bears this out — nobody was fooled for two seconds that he was the person he was pretending to be. It was obviously somebody impersonating somebody of a different gender. And again, this wasn't so much indicative of his incredible deceitfulness as a sort of detachment from reality in thinking he could get away with this sort of half funny conduct vis—à-vis some government officials on the other end of the phone.

It is true that he misused other people's identities.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The government concedes that in many instances that was with their permission. And I believe that all of the instances in which it was not with their permission, it was relatives and he sort of thought it was permissible. So again, this is a little bit different a category of an offense than somebody who steals credit card information and, you know, runs around on a buying spree completely misappropriating somebody else's identity.

And then the third factor that the government cites is the obstruction of justice, and it's clear if you look through exactly what it was that Mr. Pappas was advising the person on whose behalf he fraudulently claimed unemployment benefits to say, that you can't defend it as it was all legitimate, but mostly what Mr. Pappas said to the individual was, get a lawyer and don't talk to the investigators. He shared with the individual his misguided view that this investigation was legally baseless and that what he in fact was doing was proper. The advice that he gave to the person to talk about the offense, not completely accurate. He certainly didn't tell them, tell the truth and don't hesitate to talk to them. it tied into this fanciful theory that if you actually did a certain amount of work and I could claim that it was really on behalf of one of these companies and if you assume that I paid you this amount of money, you know, then you would be entitled to unemployment benefits, the individual in question did in fact do some work for Mr. Pappas, was in fact paid some income.

None of it justifies what happened, and we're not attempting to claim that, but again, it's not a classic obstruction of justice. As the government emphasizes, Mr. Pappas knew he was under investigation and was himself talking with the investigators, trying to justify what he did.

So at the -- and all of this is against the background of this is an individual who is clearly troubled and was not getting the proper medication during the course of time when he was engaged in this conduct. As I said at the outset, I think that's, in significant measure, his own fault. He didn't seek out the appropriate treatment for his mental health issues. It's not like somebody else dropped the ball. But the fact of the matter is, his mental state was not the mental state of somebody who deliberately goes out to violate the law and cheat the government out of this money. It doesn't rise to the level of a legal defense, but it's a relevant factor to be considered.

My submission is that at the end of the day, what Mr. Pappas needs -- let me back up before I get to that.

When I first came to represent Mr. Pappas, he was in a state where he was not properly medicated, and I can attest to the fact that he was a very difficult client to deal with. We ultimately got him properly evaluated, partially from Dr. Drob, partially from personnel at the MCC, got him properly medicated, and it's been much easier, frankly, to represent him

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

since that happened. I think a large portion of what went on here is untreated mental health issues. And my submission is that at the end of the day, what he really needs is mental health treatment, which can be accomplished as a condition of supervised release rather than further incarceration.

Now the second issue -- and it's not as important as the mental health issue but it's also an important issue -- is the family circumstances that Mr. Pappas finds himself in, which, again, I think both go to what drove him to commit these offenses. He has very difficult family circumstances with two children who have addiction issues and mental health issues of their own, and I think coping with that situation has been very difficult for him. The government in its sentencing submission says, well, that shouldn't be taken into consideration in sentencing because those two children are adults, they don't The fact of the matter is, they are living at live at home. home currently. They've relapsed in their addiction problems and they're living in the family residence. Mr. Pappas' wife is absolutely overwhelmed with trying to cope to -- with household management, with the two kids who are difficult. Mr. Pappas has been incarcerated for 14 months now, almost 14 months. I think it was the beginning of July that he was first arrested. And, frankly, it would be of great assistance to the family for him to be able to get back and help take care of household matters. Mrs. Pappas has healthcare issues of her

own that she's postponed dealing with because she can't deal with them while also managing the house and managing the two kids who have problems, and Mr. Pappas' presence at home would be of great assistance just in helping to do simple things like pay the bills and get repairs done and buying groceries but also to keep on top of the two kids who need — I say kids, they're adults, but they're his children, who really need supervision of a sort to get to the treatment programs that they need and to do the things that they need to do to straighten out their lives.

I said it before, but the conclusion is this. I think this is not a case where anybody is served by further incarceration. What Mr. Pappas needs is mental health services. The probation department recommended that as a condition of supervised release after his period of incarceration. My submission is, he's been in for 14 months already, and really what he needs is the mental health services as a condition of supervised release. He's got a family that's struggling. It's a family that obviously has a lot of problems, but I think the family will do better if Mr. Pappas can be there to assist them than if he's incarcerated for another period of time.

THE COURT: I'd like you to address a comment that Dr. Drob makes, which is troubling. This is from his report.

"Mr. Pappas is transparently manipulative in his efforts to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

utilize and perhaps exaggerate his mood symptoms in an effort to gain some real or imagined legal or financial advantage."

And then Dr. Drob goes on to comment that, "It is thus difficult to ascertain his actual condition."

Right. I think that's an absolutely MR. KLOTZ: accurate statement. I've spoken to Dr. Drob at length in addition to reading his report. And I think what he would say, because he said it to me, is that manipulative behavior is itself very often a symptom of mental health issues. A lot of mentally ill people are also manipulative, and it doesn't mean that they're not mentally ill. It's in fact very often a behavior set that exacerbates the problem, because their manipulation, frankly, is very often transparent and just makes people that they deal with even more frustrated in dealing with I think -- and I'll speak from personal experience. think that's an accurate statement of the way Mr. Pappas behaved prior to the time that he was more properly medicated at the Metropolitan Correctional Center. But I don't think Dr. Drob and I don't think any of the other numerous mental health professionals who have examined Mr. Pappas over the years has the slightest doubt that he in fact suffers from severe mental health issues. I think -- and Dr. Drob, by the way, was not the only person to make that observation. I think in the prior record -- but I'm not certain that it works its way into the report -- one of the other doctors, maybe back ten

years ago, made a similar observation. But it wasn't to the effect of: Here is somebody who is faking mental illness. It was to the effect of: Here's somebody who has very serious problems but one of the symptoms of the problems is that they're manipulative and not entirely honest about themselves and that makes it even more difficult to understand exactly what's going on. So I don't want to discount the comment because it is an important, you know, factor to take into consideration, but I don't think it undercuts the conclusion that he's an individual with mental health issues and that those mental health issues — I mean, the manipulativeness, you can actually see in the offense conduct. It's manipulating relatives, manipulating friends, manipulating other people that he knew to go along with the scheme.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Pappas, is there anything you wish to say before the court imposes sentence?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes. First of all, I'm very sorry for what I've done, but I was under tremendous pressure based on the fact that I have two children that are addicted to opiates and it's a terrible situation to be under, having those two kids. And from the auto accident, it made me TBI and made my bipolar disorder much more serious than it was, and for many years I wasn't properly medicated and I was made manic, and while I was manic, I committed this crime. But now that I've got the proper medication, I'm ready to become a productive

member of society. And I'm just asking for a second chance. And I want to go back and help my family because once you sentence me today, the \$2200 a month that my family is getting in disability income is going to be cut off and I'm not sure how my family's going to survive, your Honor, so all I'm asking is, the quicker I get back to my family, the quicker they're going to get the support they need from my disability income so things — I'm just asking for another chance, your Honor, and I really need my family to be able to survive. They need me. And thank you for your time.

THE COURT: Mr. Capone, is there anything you wish to say?

MR. CAPONE: Your Honor, I'll be very brief, and really, most of it is in my submission.

Obviously there's no dispute that Mr. Pappas does have some mental health problems, and I understand that is part of who he is, which is a relevant consideration that the court can take into account. But I still don't quite see how — the direct connection between the — those issues and the crime here. The suggestion is that his mental state gave him these delusions of grandiosity I think was the suggestion, made him think he can pull one over the system and be particularly manipulative, and I guess that's what Dr. Drob found as well, that this is a manipulative person. But maybe the defendant is just manipulative. I don't know that that's a mental health

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

This is clearly a complex and lengthy crime, that there's no suggestion that the defendant thought he was entitled to that money. He knew what he was doing, he knew he was attempting to outsmart the government. It involved a lot of work. And so I think for that reason, it was a serious crime and the defendant -- this is a defendant who is certainly in need of deterrence I think in light of the overall picture here, of the complexity of the crime, his efforts to attempt to -- not to be arrested or not to be charged when he figured out that the government was on to him. I don't think -- I do think it's classic obstruction. The defendant sat down with a witness and told him to lie to the government and came up with a story that the witness should give about work that never happened, and payments that he said were genuine that were not The defendant did talk to investigators, but it's not genuine. as if that conversation itself was full of truths. defendant drove another witness -- when another witness went in to speak with investigators before the defendant was charged, the defendant was outside waiting in his car. He was the one who drove her there. He was keeping close tabs on the investigation and doing everything he could to make sure it didn't result in his arrest; again, further indicia of manipulativeness and somebody who's in substantial need of deterrence.

So for all of those reasons and as set forth in our

submission, the government thinks that a guidelines sentence is appropriate.

appropriate sentence, I have considered all the factors listed in Title 18 United States Code Section 3553(a), including the nature and circumstances of Mr. Pappas' offense, his personal history and characteristics, the need for the sentence imposed to reflect the seriousness of the offense, to promote respect for the law, to provide just punishment, and to afford adequate deterrence.

Beginning with the nature and circumstances of the offense, the charge against Mr. Pappas stems from an investigation by the Department of Labor which uncovered his scheme to defraud the New York State Unemployment Insurance Fund. From about July 2011 to about August 2012, Mr. Pappas pretended to employ members of his family and others at two companies that he controlled. He created fake payroll records for these fake employees, indicating that they were paid exactly the minimum amount necessary to qualify for unemployment benefits. Mr. Pappas then pretended to be those employees and filed for unemployment benefits under their names after they had ostensibly been fired. After the fake employees qualified for unemployment benefits, Mr. Pappas arranged for those benefits to be paid into bank accounts that he controlled.

In perpetrating the scheme, Mr. Pappas made telephone calls to the Unemployment Insurance Fund pretending to be the fake employees, including, as Mr. Klotz said, female employees, and he used their personal information on at least some occasions without their permission or knowledge. Through this scheme Mr. Pappas defrauded the New York State Unemployment Insurance Fund of approximately \$200,000.

Sometime in early 2012, Mr. Pappas learned that he was under investigation. He did not stop his fraudulent behavior. However, instead he instructed one of the fake employees to lie to the authorities and say that he had worked for Mr. Pappas.

Back on April 15<sup>th</sup>, Mr. Pappas pleaded guilty to a superseding information charging him with one count of wire fraud.

Now let me say that with respect to the crime, it clearly involved a lot of thought and there were a lot of balls to keep up in the air because he was making multiple applications on behalf of multiple people, and then had to contact the fund on behalf of them on something like a weekly basis to maintain their eligibility. So there were a lot of moving parts here. But having said that, there is a whacky aspect to this, and when I say whacky, I mean, for example, calling the unemployment people and pretending to be a woman. It's indicative of someone who's not entirely stable.

With respect to Mr. Pappas' personal history, he's 54.

He was raised in Jamaica, Queens. His father left the family when he was 14, and he essentially became the head of the household. He has two siblings, one of whom is mentally disabled. Mr. Pappas is married and has three children in their 20s, two of whom are addicted to heroin and have been in and out of residential drug treatment programs. The other child is in college.

Mr. Pappas' wife is employed at a bank but suffers from a blood condition and has reportedly had difficulty managing her illness as well as the problems of her family while Mr. Pappas has been detained. And as Mr. Klotz indicated, he has been detained since July 1<sup>st</sup> of last year.

Mr. Pappas is an intelligent man. He has a bachelor's degree from St. John's University. He began working in the printing industry in 1982, started his own printing business in 1985, and between 1985 and 2001 owned a series of highly successful commercial printing businesses, which were quite lucrative. He has substantial assets, including several homes, although he has put these assets under the name of an entity called Pappas Family Limited Partnership. Mr. Pappas has no criminal record. He was diagnosed with ADHD as a child but appears to have performed at a very high level until about 2000, when he suffered a car accident, which has been alluded to this morning. The airbag in the car inflated, and some physicians believe that Mr. Pappas suffered a traumatic brain

injury at that time. Certainly in the years after the accident, a number of doctors have diagnosed Mr. Pappas with suffering from significant mental illnesses, including bipolar disorder, schizophrenia, posttraumatic stress disorder, and depression, and since 2002 he has taken a wide variety of psychiatric medications for these conditions.

Mr. Pappas has other medical conditions, including hearing loss, speech problems, and pain in his right leg caused by the car accident. It has been difficult to ascertain the precise nature of the defendant's mental condition and, as Mr. Klotz said this morning, what connection, if any, exists between his mental condition and his criminal conduct is the key inquiry from my perspective.

I conclude that this is one of those cases in which Mr. Pappas' mental condition does not provide him with a legal defense but nonetheless is relevant in terms of determining his culpability. I have alluded to a forensic psychological examination that was conducted by Dr. Sanford Drob of Mr. Pappas in November and December 2012, and I have studied that report. Dr. Drob found Mr. Pappas to be highly intelligent. He further concluded that nothing in prior testing, or in the tests that he himself performed, indicates that the defendant suffers from a severe neuropsychological disorder, and as I quoted a moment ago, Dr. Drob made reference to the fact that Mr. Pappas has a tendency to be "transparently"

manipulative and may exaggerate his symptoms in an effort to gain some type of advantage." And Dr. Drob did comment that in light of this characteristic, it is "difficult to ascertain his actual condition." Having said that, Dr. Drob concluded that Mr. Pappas suffers from a "clinically significant psychological disorder, characterized by depression, irritability, and mood swings." And I might say that Dr. Drob's findings in this regard are consistent with more than ten years of psychological and psychiatric examinations that have been conducted of Mr. Pappas and consistent with the fact that he's been prescribed a wide variety of serious psychiatric medications, indicating that many other doctors before Dr. Drob had concluded that Mr. Pappas suffers from serious psychological disorders.

Now while I have concluded that Mr. Pappas' mental state did not prevent him from being fully aware during the time that he was defrauding the unemployment insurance fund that what he was doing was wrong and illegal, I further conclude that his mental condition is relevant to an appropriate sentence.

The guidelines recommend a sentence of between 27 and 33 months. Probation department has recommended a sentence of 27 months. The defendant seeks a sentence of time served. And as I've indicated, he has been detained since July, early July 2012, and thus is approaching 14 months' incarceration. The

government seeks a guidelines sentence.

With all of this in mind, I will now describe the sentence I intend to impose and then I'll ask the parties if there's anything further they wish to say.

With respect to imprisonment, I intend to impose a sentence of time served. I conclude that the amount of incarceration that the defendant has already served has provided a sufficient deterrence to him with respect to future criminal conduct, and in light of his mental condition, I do tend to agree with Mr. Klotz that what he needs most at this point is intensive psychiatric treatment.

With respect to supervised release, I intend to impose a sentence of three years. Supervised release will be served on the following conditions:

The defendant shall not commit another federal, state, or local crime; he shall not illegally possess a controlled substance; he shall not possess a firearm or destructive device; he shall cooperate in the collection of DNA as directed by the probation officer; he shall refrain from any unlawful use of a controlled substance; he shall submit to one drug testing within 15 days of placement on supervised release and at least two unscheduled drug tests thereafter, as directed by the probation officer.

I intend to impose the first 13 standard conditions of supervised release, along with the following special

conditions:

The defendant shall provide the probation office with access to any requested financial information; the defendant shall not open any additional lines of credit without the approval of the probation officer; the defendant shall participate in a mental health program approved by the US Probation Office; he shall continue to take any prescribed medications unless otherwise instructed by the healthcare provider; I authorize the release of available psychological and psychiatric evaluations and reports to the healthcare provider as approved by the probation office. The defendant shall contribute to the cost of services rendered not covered by third-party payment.

The defendant is to report to the nearest probation office within 72 hours of release from custody.

The guidelines recommend a fine of between \$6,000 and \$60,000. The defendant has substantial assets. I intend to impose a \$6,000 fine.

I intend to impose a \$100 special assessment.

As to restitution, I intend to order that the defendant make restitution to the New York State Unemployment Insurance Fund in the amount of \$192,601.

I also intend to execute the consent preliminary order of forfeiture which has been handed up this morning.

Mr. Klotz, anything further you wish to say?

1 MR. KLOTZ: No, your Honor. Mr. Pappas, anything further you wish to 2 THE COURT: 3 sav? 4 THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor. 5 THE COURT: Mr. Capone, anything else from the 6 government? 7 MR. CAPONE: No, your Honor. THE COURT: Now, Mr. Pappas, for the reasons I just 8 9 stated, it is the judgment of this court that you be sentenced 10 to time served and three years of supervised release. Your supervised release will be subject to the 11 mandatory, standard, and special conditions I just listed. 12 13 You are ordered to pay a fine of \$6,000, which will be 14 due immediately, and a special assessment in the amount of 15 \$100. You are ordered to pay restitution in the amount of 16 17 \$192,601 to the New York State Unemployment Insurance Fund. Payments are to be made to the Clerk, United States District 18 Court, 500 Pearl Street, New York, New York, 10007, for 19 20 disbursement to the New York State Unemployment Insurance Fund. Restitution is to be paid in full by August 14<sup>th</sup>, 2014. 21 22 Are there any open counts, Mr. Capone? 23 MR. CAPONE: Your Honor, there is an underlying 24 indictment, and the government would move to dismiss that. 25 THE COURT: All right. That motion is granted.

Mr. Pappas, I'm required to advise you of your appeal rights. You can appeal your conviction if you believe that your guilty plea was unlawful or involuntary or if there was some other fundamental defect in the proceedings that was not waived by your guilty plea. You also have a statutory right to appeal your sentence under certain circumstances. With few exceptions, any notice of appeal must be filed within 14 days of judgment being entered in your case. Judgment will likely be entered today. Mr. Klotz will discuss with you whether or not you wish to file a notice of appeal. If you're not able to pay the cost of an appeal, you pay apply for leave to appeal in forma pauperis. If you request, the clerk of the court will prepare and file a notice of appeal on your behalf.

Defense counsel has requested that his sentencing submission be sealed because it discusses the defendant and his family's medical condition. That application is granted.

Is there anything further?

MR. CAPONE: No, your Honor. The government's submission I guess will -- I also filed that under seal, so it should remain under seal as well.

THE COURT: All right. Then it will remain under seal.

MR. CAPONE: Thank you, your Honor.

MR. KLOTZ: Nothing further, your Honor.